



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/096,515	06/12/1998	YUJI INOUE	35.G2190	1905

5514 7590 03/19/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

DORSEY, DENNIS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/096,515

Applicant(s)

INOUE ET AL.

Examiner

Dennis L Dorsey

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-120 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 5 and 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 6-12 and 14-120 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 29.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3637

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4, 6-12, and 14-120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoyama et al. in view of Frihart et al.

Itoyama et al. teaches all the limitations of the above claims except the specific composition of the jacket of the connector and electrical lead, the electrical connector contacting the backing material, and the specific composition of the backing material.

Itoyama teaches a solar cell (101), fixed to a metal substrate (107), fixed to a load bearing, water resistance and heat resistance backing material (104), electrically connected (113) between the backing material and building material, spacers (102), power converter (column 3, lines 12-15), and air flow apparatus (see figure 8).

The Applicant's disclosure of the prior art teaches that it is well known for one skill in the art to lengthen the electrical connector causing it to be in contact with the backing material to make connecting the panels easier (page 3, lines 18-25).

The Applicant's disclosure of the prior art further teaches that coating conductive leads is widely used (page 4, lines 7-8). The Applicant's disclosure of the prior art continues to and teaches that it is well known in the art to use a backing material of asphalt, vinyl chloride, polyurethane, or polystyrene (page 4, lines 8-11).

Art Unit: 3637

Frihart et al. teaches a conductive wire coating of a polyamide resin composition for insulation and protection of the wire providing highly desirable properties (see Abstract).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wire coating of the Itoyama reference and select the material as taught by Frihart et al., since it is held to be within the skill of a worker in the art to select a known material as a matter of design choice to provide superior protection of the electrical lead.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to pick and choose among the asphalt resins or any of the available materials readily available on the market to use as the backing material or roof board as taught by the Applicant's disclosure of the prior art, since it is held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a suitable material well known in the art.

The Examiner takes the position that since one of the materials was found among the group of materials presented possible and since the materials appear to be equivalent according to the Applicant's disclosure (page 27, line 8-15) and since no criticality is given to one material over the other and since it is the Applicant's intention to cover various modifications and equivalent arrangements of the instant invention (page 33, line 7-9) the different of arrangements of different materials as set forth by the limitations of the newly added claims are functionally equivalent and thus rejected according to the above paragraphs.

Art Unit: 3637

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 12, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant's arguments that there is no motivation to combine the art is not persuasive simple because its known in the art to provide protection for the electrical lead and one skilled in the art would look to wire coating art for teachings on wire protective coatings as taught by the Frihart '086 reference. The combination of the references provides the teaching of the claims as set forth above. The Examiner once again emphasizes that since one of the materials was found among the group of materials presented possible and since the materials appear to be equivalent according to the Applicant's disclosure (page 27, line 8-15) and since no criticality is given to one material over the other and since it is the Applicant's intention to cover various modifications and equivalent arrangements of the instant invention (page 33, line 7-9) the different of arrangements of different materials as set forth by the limitations of the newly added claims are functionally equivalent and thus rejected according to the above paragraphs. The Examiner further maintains that one skilled in the art would have knowledge that different materials react differently to other materials and that one skilled in the art would provide materials that do not chemically react. Thus, when presented with the problem of coatings with cracks one skilled in the art would provide a better coating to last longer.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Art Unit: 3637

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L Dorsey whose telephone number is 703-306-9137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703-308-2486. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1020.

DLD 
March 14, 2003

LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

